arXiv:1701.00424v1 [math.NA] 2 Jan 2017

Discrete maximum principles for nonlinear elliptic finite element problems on Riemannian manifolds with boundary

J. Karátson[1], B. Kovács[2,*], S. Korotov[3]

January 3, 2017

[1] Department of Applied Analysis & MTA-ELTE Numerical Analysis and Large Networks Research Group, ELTE University; Department of Analysis, Technical University; Budapest, Hungary; karatson@cs.elte.hu

[2] Mathematisches Institut, Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany, e-mail: kovacs@na.uni-tuebingen.de

[3] Department of Computing, Mathematics and Physics, Bergen University College, Bergen, Norway; e-mail: sergey.korotov@hib.no

Abstract: The maximum principle forms an important qualitative property of second order elliptic equations, therefore its discrete analogues, the so-called discrete maximum principles (DMPs) have drawn much attention. In this paper DMPs are established for nonlinear surface finite element problems on Riemannian manifolds, corresponding to the classical pointwise maximum principles on surfaces in the spirit of Pucci et al. Various real-life examples illustrate the scope of the results.

Keywords: nonlinear elliptic problems on surfaces, maximum principle, discrete maximum principle, finite element method, simplicial mesh.

Mathematical Subject Classification: 35B50, 35J65, 65N30, 65N50

1 Introduction

The maximum principle forms an important qualitative property of second order elliptic equations [17, 24, 25]. We will refer to such results as continuous maximum principles (CMPs). Typical maximum principles often arise in a form stating that a solution attains a nonnegative maximum on the boundary, i.e.

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u \le \max\{0, \max_{\partial S} u\}. \tag{1}$$

CMPs have also been studied on Riemannian manifolds. Thereby the main subject is often an Omori–Yau type maximum principle, but in this paper we are interested in classical pointwise versions, such as the ones studied by Antonini, Mugnai and Pucci in [2], which give analogous results to (1).

The discrete analogues of CMPs, the so-called discrete maximum principles (DMPs) have drawn much attention. The DMP is in fact an important measure of the qualitative reliability of the numerical scheme, otherwise one could get unphysical numerical solutions like negative concentrations, etc.

We are interested for DMPs on a surface with boundary, in the context of the surface finite element method (SFEM). Originally, the surface FEM was developed by Dziuk in [12] for elliptic problems on closed surfaces (and further developed for evolving surfaces by Dziuk and Elliott in [13, 14]). The theory was extended to elliptic problems on surfaces with boundaries in the recent preprint [5]. In such a case a DMP reproduces one of the above relations for the surface finite element solution u_h instead of u. Various DMPs in Euclidean domains, including geometric conditions on the computational meshes for FEM solutions, have been given, e.g. in [8, 9, 11, 26]. The authors' previous work, e.g. [18, 21, 22], involves various types of linear and nonlinear equations and systems, and typical geometric conditions are nonobtuseness or acuteness in the case of simplicial meshes.

To our knowledge, no DMP has been established for elliptic problems on Riemannian manifolds yet. In this paper we provide such a result in the spirit of [2] and using analogous treatment of the finite element matrix as in our earlier paper [18]. We work in the mentioned surface finite element setting, cf. [5, 12]. The surface approximation introduces an additional geometric error, which requires extra care during the analysis as compared to the flat domain case. In addition, the issue of generating meshes with suitable angle properties is addressed. The theoretical results are supported by numerical tests.

2 Formulation and properties of the problem

Our formulation of the problem is based on [2]. We consider a nonlinear elliptic problem which is, on the one hand, a special case of the problem studied in [2] on manifolds, and on the other hand, an analogue of the problem studied in our earlier paper [18] in the context of DMP on usual Euclidean domains. Due to [2], there holds a CMP for this problem, and our goal is to adapt our approach from [18] to verify a DMP as well for proper SFEM discretisations [5, 12].

We follow [2] and [5, 12] for the description of the manifold and of the elliptic problem.

2.1 The nonlinear elliptic problem on a Riemannian manifold

2.1.1 The manifold

Following the setting and notations of [2], let $\mathcal{M}$ be a smooth complete d-dimensional Riemannian manifold, and let $S \subset \mathcal{M}$ be a closed bounded and regular subdomain of $\mathcal{M}$, so that $\overline{S}$ is a smooth manifold with boundary, with outward normal ν. Furthermore, let δ denote the associated signed distance function, satisfying $S = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \mid \delta(x) = 0\}$ and $\nabla\delta = \nu$, cf. [12, 14]. In the sequel we shall write $TS \times_S \mathbb{R}$ in place of $TS \times_S (S \times \mathbb{R})$ to denote the fibered product bundle. In analogy with the Euclidean case, points of $TS \times_S \mathbb{R}$ will be denoted with (x, z, ξ), where $(x, \xi) \in TS$ and $(x, z) \in S \times \mathbb{R}$. Integrals will be taken with respect to the natural Riemannian measure, denoted by $d\mathcal{M}$. The surface gradient, or tangential gradient (i.e. the orthographic projection of the standard gradient onto the

surface) of a function u on S will be simply denoted by $\nabla_S u$, i.e. $\nabla_S u = \nabla u - (\nabla u \cdot \nu)\nu$. Further, Δ_S denotes the Laplace–Beltrami operator, and div_S the tangential divergence.

For $p \geq 1$, the Lebesgue and Sobolev norms are defined as

$$\|u\|_{p,S} := \Big(\int_S |u|^p \,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{M}\Big)^{1/p} \quad \text{and} \qquad \|u\|_{1,p,S} := \|u\|_{p,S} + \|\nabla u\|_{p,S}\,,$$

respectively, where $|u| := g(u,u)^{1/2}$ using the metric tensor g, further, $W^{1,p}(S)$ and $W_0^{1,p}(S)$ are defined as the closure of $C^\infty(S)$ and $C_0^\infty(S)$, respectively, in the Sobolev norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,p,S}$. We define $p' := p/(p-1)$ if $p > 1$ and $p' := \infty$ if $p = 1$ (see e.g. [12, 14]).

There are similar Sobolev embedding estimates of $W^{1,p}(S)$ available as in the Euclidean case. Let $p^* := \frac{pd}{d-p}$ if $d > p$ and $p^* := \infty$ if $d \leq p$. Here S is a closed bounded subdomain of the complete Riemannian d-manifold $\mathcal{M}$, hence it is a compact Riemannian d-manifold itself. Therefore, by [3], for all $1 \leq p_1 < p^*$ we have $W^{1,p}(S) \subset L^{p_1}(S)$ and

$$\|v\|_{p_1,S} \leq k_1 \|v\|_{1,p,S} \qquad (\forall v \in W^{1,p}(S)) \tag{2}$$

for some constant $k_1 > 0$ depending on p and p_1 but independent of v.

2.1.2 The problem

We consider a nonlinear boundary value problem of the following type, involving a scalar nonlinear coefficient in the principal part:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_S\Big(b(x,u,\nabla_S u)\,\nabla_S u\Big) + q(x,u) = f(x) & \text{on } S, \\ u = g(x) & \text{on } \partial S, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

with the bounded surface $S \subset \mathcal{M}$, with boundary ∂S, under the following conditions:

Assumptions 2.1.2.

(A1) Let $p \geq 2$ be a given parameter.

(A2) The scalar functions $b : S \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}$, $q : \overline{S} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous. There holds $f \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$, further, $g = g^*|_{\partial S}$ for some $g^* \in W^{1,\gamma}(S)$, where $\gamma \geq p$ if $p > d$ and $\gamma > d$ if $p \leq d$.

(A3) (Uniform ellipticity.) The function b satisfies

$$\mu_0 + \mu_1|\xi|^{p-2} \leq b(x,z,\xi) \leq M_0 + M_1|\xi|^{p-2}$$

with constants $\mu_0, \mu_1, M_0, M_1 > 0$ independent of $(x,z,\xi) \in S \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

(A4) Let $2 \leq p_1 < +\infty$ if $d \leq p$, or $2 \leq p_1 < \hat{p} := \frac{2d}{d-p}$ if $d > p$. There exist constants $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$ such that for any $x \in S$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}$ the following growth conditions hold, for every $z \geq 0$,

$$0 \leq q(x,0) \equiv q(x,z) \quad (\forall z \leq 0), \qquad 0 \leq q(x,z) - q(x,0) \leq \alpha z + \beta z^{p_1 - 1}.$$

The weak solution $u \in W^{1,p}(S)$ of problem (3) will be defined as follows:

$$\int_S \left[b(x,u,\nabla_S u)\ \nabla_S u \cdot \nabla_S v + q(x,u)v \right]\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{M} = \int_S fv\ \mathrm{d}\mathcal{M} \qquad (\forall v \in W_0^{1,p}(S)) \tag{4}$$

$$\text{and} \quad u - g^* \in W_0^{1,p}(S). \tag{5}$$

Remark 1. As mentioned before, related problems have been studied in the context of the DMP on usual Euclidean domains in our earlier paper [18], i.e. the above problem (3) is a surface analogue of the problems considered therein. Now in (3) we only consider Dirichlet boundary conditions, on the other hand, compared to [18], we impose more general growth conditions allowing $p \neq 2$ as well, which involves a more general setting using the Banach space $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

In the sequel we omit the sign $\mathrm{d}\mathcal{M}$ in the integrals for brevity, i.e. $\int_S f := \int_S f\,\mathrm{d}\mathcal{M}$.

2.2 Continuous maximum principle on the manifold

2.2.1 Preliminaries

We will rely on [2], where CMPs are proved for a general class of elliptic inequalities on manifolds. We summarize the required background in a rewritten form involving elliptic equations with right-hand side of given sign.

Let us consider an elliptic equation

$$-\operatorname{div}_S \mathbf{K}(x,u,\nabla_S u) + F(x,u,\nabla_S u) = k(x) \tag{6}$$

on the domain $S \subset \mathcal{M}$ under the following conditions:

Assumptions 2.2.1.

(i) The functions $\mathbf{K} : TS \times_S \mathbb{R} \to TS$ and $F : TS \times_S \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are continuous, further, $\mathbf{K}(x,z,\xi) \in T_x\mathcal{M}$ for all $(x,z) \in S \times \mathbb{R}$ and $\xi \in T_x\mathcal{M}$.

(ii) There exist constants $a_1 > 0$ and $b_1, a_2 \geq 0$ such that for all $(x,z,\xi) \in TS \times_S \mathbb{R}$ there holds

$$\mathbf{K}(x,z,\xi) \cdot \xi \geq a_1|\xi|^p - a_2|z|^p, \qquad F(x,z,\xi) \geq -b_1|\xi|^p\ .$$

The treatment in [2] involves *p-regular weak solutions* of (6), defined as functions $u \in L^1_{loc}(S)$ satisfying

$$\mathbf{K}(\cdot,u,\nabla_S u) \in L^{p'}_{loc}(S,TS), \quad F(\cdot,u,\nabla_S u) \in L^{p'}_{loc}(S)$$

and demanding (4) only for compactly supported $v \in W_0^{1,p}(S)$. The following result holds:

Theorem 1. *Let Assumptions 2.2.1 hold with $a_2 = 0$ in item (ii). Let u be a p-regular weak solution of (6) such that $u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(S)$, and let the right-hand side $k \leq 0$ on S. If $u \leq M$ on ∂S for some constant $M \geq 0$, then $u \leq M$ in S.*

In fact, this result is the reformulation of [2, Theorem 3.3.] for equations instead of inequalities and with rearranged signs.

2.2.2 CMP for the studied class

We reformulate the above CMP in the vein of inequality (1).

Theorem 2. *Let Assumptions 2.1.2 hold. Assume that u is a weak solution of problem (3), defined as in (4)–(5), which satisfies $u \in C(\overline{S})$. Let*

$$f(x) - q(x,0) \le 0 \quad (a.e.\ \forall x \in S). \tag{7}$$

(1) Then

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u \le \max\{0, \max_{\partial S} g\}. \tag{8}$$

(2) In particular, if $g \ge 0$ then

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u = \max_{\partial S} g, \tag{9}$$

and, if $g \le 0$ then we have the nonpositivity property

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u \le 0.$$

(3) If we do not assume $u \in C(\overline{S})$ but only $g \in L^\infty(S)$, then the above statements hold with replacing each max *by* ess sup*, respectively.*

Proof. We verify that problem (3) under Assumptions 2.1.2 is a special case of problem (6) under Assumptions 2.2.1. Throughout, the notation (x, z, ξ) will stand for the general points of $S \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$. We first subtract $q(x,0)$ from both sides of (3), then

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_S \Big(b(x,u,\nabla_S u)\, \nabla_S u \Big) + \hat{q}(x,u) = \hat{f}(x) & \text{on } S, \\ u = g(x) & \text{on } \partial S \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where

$$\hat{q}(x,z) := q(x,z) - q(x,0), \qquad \hat{f}(x) := f(x) - q(x,0)$$

for all $x \in S$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Let

$$\mathbf{K}(x,z,\xi) := b(x,z,\xi)\,\xi, \qquad F(x,z,\xi) := \hat{q}(x,z).$$

Owing to the continuity of b and q, assumption (i) obviously holds. Further, for all arguments, assumptions (A3) and (A4) yield

$$\mathbf{K}(x,z,\xi) \cdot \xi = b(x,z,\xi)\,|\xi|^2 \ge \mu_0 |\xi|^2 + \mu_1 |\xi|^p \ge \mu_1 |\xi|^p$$

and

$$F(x,z,\xi) \ge 0,$$

i.e. assumption (ii) holds with $a_1 := \mu_1 > 0$, $a_2 = 0$ and $b_1 = 0$.

We also have to check that u is a p-regular weak solution of (6) such that $u \in W^{1,p}_{loc}(S)$, and the right-hand side satisfies $k \le 0$ on S. Here, first, assumption (A3) yields

$$|\mathbf{K}(x,z,\xi)| \le b(x,z,\xi)\,|\xi| \le M_0 |\xi| + M_1 |\xi|^{p-1},$$

hence

$$|\mathbf{K}(\cdot, u, \nabla_S u)|^{p'} \le M_3 |\nabla_S u|^{p'} + M_4 |\nabla_S u|^{(p-1)p'} = M_3 |\nabla_S u|^{p'} + M_4 |\nabla_S u|^p.$$

Here the second term is integrable on S since the weak solution $u \in W^{1,p}(S)$, and also the first term is integrable since $p' \le 2 \le p$. Hence $\mathbf{K}(\cdot, u, \nabla_S u) \in L^{p'}(S, TS)$. Similarly, from (A4), for all arguments

$$0 \le \hat{q}(x, z) \le \alpha |z| + \beta |z|^{p_1 - 1},$$

hence

$$|F(\cdot, u, \nabla_S u)|^{p'} = |q(\cdot, u)|^{p'} \le \tilde{\alpha} |u|^{p'} + \tilde{\beta} |u|^p$$

is integrable on S since $u \in L^p(S)$ and $p' \le 2 \le p$. Also, since $u \in W^{1,p}(S)$, all local requirements are fulfilled even globally on S. Equation (4) holds for all $v \in W_0^{1,p}(S)$, hence especially for compactly supported $v \in W_0^{1,p}(S)$. Altogether, u satisfies all criteria of a p-regular weak solution. Further, for all $x \in S$, now

$$k(x) := \hat{f}(x) := f(x) - q(x, 0) \le 0.$$

That is, we can apply Theorem 1: if $u \le M$ on ∂S for some constant $M \ge 0$, then $u \le M$ in S. Now we can already prove the desired statements.

(1) Let $\mu := \max\limits_{\partial S} u = \max\limits_{\partial S} g$. If $\mu \ge 0$ then we can apply Theorem 1 with choice $M := \mu$, namely, since $u \le \mu$ on ∂S, therefore $u \le \mu$ in S too, i.e.

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u \le \mu = \max\{0, \mu\} = \max\{0, \max_{\partial S} g\}.$$

If $\mu < 0$ then we can apply Theorem 1 with choice $M := 0$, namely, since $u \le 0$ on ∂S, therefore $u \le 0$ in S too, i.e.

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u \le 0 = \max\{0, \mu\} = \max\{0, \max_{\partial S} g\}.$$

In both cases we have obtained the desired property (8).

(2)–(3) These are obvious consequences of statement (1). □

In the special case $q \equiv 0$, the equality (9) holds without assuming $g \ge 0$:

Theorem 3. *Consider problem (3) with $q \equiv 0$, under the assumptions of Theorem 2. That is, let (A1)–(A3) hold, $u \in C(\overline{S})$, and assumption (7) now takes the form $f(x) \le 0$ ($\forall x \in S$). Then*

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u = \max_{\partial S} g. \tag{11}$$

Proof. If $\max\limits_{\partial S} g \ge 0$ then (8) implies (11). Let $\max\limits_{\partial S} g < 0$, say, $\max\limits_{\partial S} g = -K$ with some $K > 0$. Then the function $w := u + K$ satisfies the same type of problem with right-hand side f and b.c. $g + K$, respectively, hence Theorem 2 is valid for this problem as well, and (8) for w yields

$$\max_{\overline{S}} w \le \max\{0, \max_{\partial S} (g + K)\} = 0.$$

Then

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u \le -K = \max_{\partial S} g.$$

□

Remark 2. We note that the corresponding minimum principles and nonnegativity property hold if the sign conditions on f are reversed.

2.3 Computational scheme: the surface finite element method

The smooth surface S with boundary ∂S is approximated by a triangulated one denoted by S_h, whose vertices $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_{\bar{n}}$, are sitting on the surface, also boundary nodes of S_h are sitting on ∂S, and it is given as

$$S_h = \bigcup_{T \in \mathcal{T}_h} T.$$

We always assume that the simplices T form an admissible triangulation (i.e. partition) $\mathcal{T}_h$, with h denoting the maximum diameter. Admissible triangulations were introduced in [13, Section 5.1]: S_h is a uniform triangulation, i.e. every $T \in \mathcal{T}_h$ satisfies that the inner radius σ_h is bounded from below by ch with $c > 0$, and S_h is not a global double covering of S. The discrete tangential gradient on the discrete surface S_h is given by

$$\nabla_{S_h} \phi = \nabla \phi - (\nabla \phi \cdot \nu_h)\, \nu_h,$$

understood in a piecewise sense, with ν_h denoting the normal to S_h, cf. [12]. The boundary of the approximation surface is simply ∂S_h, which is an analogous approximation of ∂S.

We define the surface finite element discretisation of our problem, following [12] and [5]. We use simplicial elements and continuous piecewise linear basis functions. The finite element subspace V_h is spanned by the continuous, piecewise linear basis functions χ_j, satisfying

$$\chi_j(B_i) = \delta_{ij} \quad \text{for all } i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, \bar{n},$$

therefore

$$V_h = \operatorname{span}\left\{\chi_1, \chi_2, \ldots, \chi_{\bar{n}}\right\}.$$

Now, let $n < \bar{n}$ be such that

$$B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_n$$

are the vertices that lie on S_h but not on ∂S_h, and let

$$B_{n+1}, \ldots, B_{\bar{n}}$$

be the vertices that lie only on ∂S_h. Then the basis functions $\chi_1, \chi_2, \ldots, \chi_n$ satisfy the homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition on ∂S_h. Hence, we can define

$$V_h^0 := \operatorname{span}\{\chi_1, \chi_2, \ldots, \chi_n\} \ \subset W_0^{1,p}(S_h).$$

Further, let

$$g_h = \sum_{j=n+1}^{\bar{n}} g_j \chi_j \ \in V_h \tag{12}$$

(with $g_j \in \mathbb{R}$) be the piecewise linear approximation of the function g on ∂S_h (and on the neighbouring elements).

2.3.1 Lift

In the following we recall the so-called lift operator, which was introduced in [12] and further investigated in [13]. The lift operator projects a finite element function on the discrete surface onto a function on the smooth surface.

Using the oriented distance function δ (cf. [13, Section 2.1]), for a continuous function $\eta_h \colon S_h \to \mathbb{R}$ its lift is defined as

$$\eta_h^l(P) := \eta_h(x), \qquad x \in S_h,$$

where for every $x \in S_h$ the value $P = P(x) \in S$ is uniquely defined via

$$x = P + \nu(P)\delta(x). \tag{13}$$

By η^{-l} we mean the function whose lift is η. Further, we have the lifted finite element spaces

$$\begin{aligned} V_h^l &:= \big\{\varphi_h = \phi_h^l \mid \ \phi_h \in V_h\big\}, \\ (V_h^0)^l &:= \big\{\varphi_h = \phi_h^l \mid \ \phi_h \in V_h^0\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

The following equivalence between discrete and continuous norms has been shown in [10, 12] for functions $\eta_h : S_h \to \mathbb{R}$ with lift $\eta_h^l : S \to \mathbb{R}$.

Lemma 1 (equivalence of norms)**.** *The original and lifted norms are equivalent in both the L^p and $W^{1,p}$ case, independently of sufficiently small mesh sizes h. That is, there exist constants $c, h_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < h \le h_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} c^{-1}\|\eta_h\|_{L^p(S_h)} \le \|\eta_h^l\|_{L^p(S)} \le c\|\eta_h\|_{L^p(S_h)} \qquad (\forall \eta_h \in L^p(S_h)), \\ c^{-1}\|\eta_h\|_{W^{1,p}(S_h)} \le \|\eta_h^l\|_{W^{1,p}(S)} \le c\|\eta_h\|_{W^{1,p}(S_h)} \qquad (\forall \eta_h \in W^{1,p}(S_h)). \end{aligned}$$

2.3.2 The discrete problem

In order to find the approximate solution of (3), we have to solve the counterpart of (4)–(5) in V_h. We note here that in order to transfer the assumptions on the coefficient functions (A1)–(A4) to the discrete level we have to use negative lifts in the spatial variable. For any $x \in S_h$ with corresponding lift $P \in S$, cf. (13), we set

$$b^{-l}(x, \cdot, \cdot) = b(P, \cdot, \cdot),$$

and similarly using the negative lift in the first argument of all coefficient functions (f, q, r, etc.), as well. No lift is used in the other arguments. By this construction all the properties of (A1)–(A4) are clearly transferred to these lifted functions, with S_h instead of S.

Following (10), we first subtract $q^{-l}(x, 0)$ from both sides and consider the following discrete problem: find $u_h \in V_h$ such that

$$\int_{S_h} \big(b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\ \nabla_{S_h} u_h \cdot \nabla_{S_h} v_h + \hat{q}^{-l}(x, u_h) v_h\big) = \int_{S_h} \hat{f}^{-l} v_h \qquad (\forall v_h \in V_h^0), \tag{14}$$

$$\text{and} \qquad u_h - g_h \in V_h^0 \tag{15}$$

where

$$\hat{q}^{-l}(x,z) := q^{-l}(x,z) - q^{-l}(x,0), \qquad \hat{f}^{-l}(x) := f^{-l}(x) - q^{-l}(x,0)$$

for all $x \in S_h$, $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Further, denote

$$r^{-l}(x,z) := \begin{cases} \dfrac{q^{-l}(x,z) - q^{-l}(x,0)}{z}, & \text{if } z > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } z \le 0. \end{cases}$$

Then, using also assumption (A4),

$$\hat{q}^{-l}(x,z) = r^{-l}(x,z)\, z\,, \qquad 0 \le r^{-l}(x,z) \le \alpha + \beta |z|^{p_1 - 2} \qquad (\forall x \in S_h,\ z \in \mathbb{R}). \tag{16}$$

In what follows, we will rewrite problem (14) as

$$\int_{S_h} \left(b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\, \nabla_{S_h} u_h \cdot \nabla_{S_h} v_h + r^{-l}(x, u_h) u_h v_h \right) = \int_{S_h} \hat{f}^{-l} v_h \qquad (\forall v_h \in V_h^0). \tag{17}$$

We set

$$u_h = \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} c_j \chi_j, \tag{18}$$

and look for the coefficients $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_{\bar{n}}$.

Lemma 2. *Let g^* and γ be as given in Assumption 2.1.2 (A2). Then there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that for all $h \le h_0$ with a $h_0 > 0$ sufficiently small, the discrete function g_h, from* (12)*, satisfies*

$$\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} \le\ c \|g^*\|_{1,\gamma,S}\,. \tag{19}$$

Proof. The assumption on γ in (A2) implies that in each case we have $\gamma \ge p$ and $\gamma > d$. Since the compact manifold S_h has bounded measure, the relation $\gamma \ge p$ implies that

$$\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} \le\ c_1 \|g_h\|_{1,\gamma,S_h}$$

for some constant $c_1 > 0$ independent of h. Further, the relation $\gamma > d$ implies that $W^{1,\gamma}(S_h) \subset C(S_h)$, see, e.g., [1]. Hence, by [7, Thm. 3.1.6], the stability of the Lagrange interpolation holds for $(g^*)^{-l}$ in $W^{1,\gamma}$-norm on each triangle and hence also on all S_h, therefore

$$\|g_h\|_{1,\gamma,S_h} \le\ c_2 \|(g^*)^{-l}\|_{1,\gamma,S_h}$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$ independent of h. Finally, Lemma 1 implies that

$$\|(g^*)^{-l}\|_{1,\gamma,S_h} \le\ c_3 \|g^*\|_{1,\gamma,S}$$

for some constant $c_3 > 0$ independent of h. These three estimates together yield the desired result. □

Later on the norm-boundedness of the SFEM solutions will play an important role.

Lemma 3. *The norms $\|u_h\|_{1,p,S_h}$ are bounded independently of h.*

Proof. We will use the shorthand notation

$$|v_h|_{1,p,S_h} := \|\nabla_{S_h} v_h\|_{p,S_h}$$

Since (15) shows that $v_h := u_h - g_h \in V_h^0$, we use it as a test function in the discrete weak problem (17). Rearranging the terms, with g_h on the right, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{S_h} \big(b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\ |\nabla_{S_h} u_h|^2 + r^{-l}(x, u_h)|u_h|^2\big) \\
&= \int_{S_h} b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\nabla_{S_h} u_h \cdot \nabla_{S_h} g_h + \int_{S_h} \Big(r^{-l}(x, u_h)u_h g_h + \hat{f}^{-l}(u_h - g_h)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate this equality appropriately from both above and below. For the lower bound of the left-hand side we use (A3), which yields $b^{-l}(x, \cdot, \xi)|\xi|^2 \geq \mu_1|\xi|^p$ $(x \in S_h)$, and since $r^{-l}(x, \cdot) \geq 0$ $(x \in S_h)$, we obtain the lower bound

$$\mu_1|u_h|^p_{1,p,S_h} = \mu_1 \int_{S_h} |\nabla_{S_h} u_h|^p \leq \int_{S_h} b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\ |\nabla_{S_h} u_h|^2 + r^{-l}(x, u_h)|u_h|^2. \quad (20)$$

For the first term on the right-hand side, we have from (A3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S_h} b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\nabla_{S_h} u_h \cdot \nabla_{S_h} g_h &\leq \int_{S_h} (M_0|\nabla_{S_h} u_h| + M_1|\nabla_{S_h} u_h|^{p-1})\ |\nabla_{S_h} g_h| \\
&\leq M_0|u_h|_{1,p',S_h}|g_h|_{1,p,S_h} + M_1|u_h|^{p-1}_{1,p,S_h}|g_h|_{1,p,S_h} \\
&\leq c\big(M_0|u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + M_1|u_h|^{p-1}_{1,p,S_h}\big)\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}
\end{aligned}$$

using Hölder's inequality, with $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p'} = 1$, $p' \leq 2 \leq p$, and the boundedness of the surface. For the second term on the right-hand side, using (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S_h} \Big(r^{-l}(x, u_h)u_h g_h + \hat{f}^{-l}(u_h - g_h)\Big) &= \int_{S_h} \Big(r^{-l}(x, v_h + g_h)(v_h + g_h)g_h + \hat{f}^{-l} v_h\Big) \\
&\leq \int_{S_h} \Big((\alpha + \beta|v_h + g_h|^{p_1 - 2})(v_h + g_h)g_h + \hat{f}^{-l} v_h\Big) \\
&\leq \big(\hat{k}_1|v_h|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}\big)\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} \\
&\quad + \big(\hat{k}_1|v_h|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}\big)^{p_1 - 1}\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} \\
&\quad + c\hat{k}_1\|\hat{f}\|_{p',S}|v_h|_{1,p,S_h},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last estimates is obtained, similarly as before, using repeatedly Hölder's inequality (with $p' \leq 2 \leq p$) and again the boundedness of the surface, and the equivalent version of (2) on $W_0^{1,p}(S_h)$:

$$\|v\|_{p_1,S_h} \leq \hat{k}_1|v|_{1,p,S_h}, \qquad (\forall v \in W_0^{1,p}(S_h)),$$

together with the bound $\|\hat{f}^{-l}\|_{p',S_h} \leq c\|\hat{f}\|_{p',S}$. This can be further estimated using

$$|v_h|_{1,p,S_h} \leq |u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + |g_h|_{1,p,S_h} \leq |u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}$$

in each term. Altogether, we obtain

$$|u_h|^p_{1,p,S_h} \le c\Big(\big(|u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + 2\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}\big)\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} + \big(|u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}\big)^{p_1-1}\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} + c\|\hat{f}\|_{p',S}(|u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h})\Big),$$

a polynomial of degree $p-1$ of $|u_h|_{1,p,S_h}$ on the right-hand side, whose coefficients, containing $\|\hat{f}\|_{p',S}$ and $\|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h}$, are bounded independently of h, owing to (19). Further, we have a power p of $|u_h|_{1,p,S_h}$ on the left-hand side. Since the latter is bounded by the former, this implies that $|u_h|_{1,p,S_h}$ is bounded. Then $|v_h|_{1,p,S_h} \le |u_h|_{1,p,S_h} + |g_h|_{1,p,S_h}$ is also bounded (using again (19) for the term with g_h). Here $v_h \in V_h^0$, where the norms $\|\cdot\|_{1,p,S_h}$ and $|\cdot|_{1,p,S_h}$ are equivalent, hence $\|v_h\|_{1,p,S_h}$ is also bounded by some $K > 0$. Finally, due to Lemma 2,

$$\|u_h\|_{1,p,S_h} \le \|v_h\|_{1,p,S_h} + \|g_h\|_{1,p,S_h} \le K + c\|g^*\|_{1,\gamma,S}\,,$$

i.e. it is also bounded independently of h. □

2.3.3 The nonlinear algebraic system

Now we turn to the nonlinear algebraic system corresponding to (14). For any $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = (c_1, ..., c_{\bar{n}})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{n}}$, $i = 1, 2, ..., n$ and $j = 1, 2, ..., \bar{n}$, we set

$$b_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \int_{S_h} b^{-l}\Big(x, \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{n}} c_k\chi_k, \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{n}} c_k\nabla_{S_h}\chi_k\Big)\ \nabla_{S_h}\chi_j \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\chi_i,$$

$$r_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \int_{S_h} r^{-l}\Big(x, \sum_{k=1}^{\bar{n}} c_k\chi_k\Big)\chi_j\chi_i, \qquad d_i = \int_{S_h} \hat{f}^{-l}\chi_i,$$

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = b_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) + r_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}).$$

Putting (18) and $v_h = \chi_i$ into (17), we obtain the $n \times \bar{n}$ system of algebraic equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\, c_j = d_i, \quad i = 1, 2, ..., n. \tag{21}$$

Using the notations

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{A}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \{a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d} = \{d_j\},\ \mathbf{c} = \{c_j\}, && i = 1, 2, ..., n,\ j = 1, 2, ..., n, \\ &\tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \{a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \{c_j\}, && i = 1, 2, ..., n,\ j = n+1, ..., \bar{n}, \end{aligned}$$

the system (21) turns into

$$\mathbf{A}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\mathbf{c} + \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{d}. \tag{22}$$

Defining further

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{A}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) & \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\end{bmatrix}, \qquad \bar{\mathbf{c}} = \begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{c} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{c}}\end{bmatrix}, \tag{23}$$

we rewrite (22) as follows

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{d}.$$

In order to obtain a system with a square matrix, we enlarge our system to an $\bar{n} \times \bar{n}$ one. Namely, since $u_h = g_h$ on ∂S_h, the coordinates c_i with $n+1 \leq i \leq \bar{n}$ satisfy automatically $c_i = g_i$, i.e.

$$\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = \tilde{\mathbf{g}},$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = \{g_j\}, \quad j = n+1, ..., \bar{n}.$$

That is, we can replace (22) by the equivalent system

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) & \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{c}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{d} \\ \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \end{bmatrix} .$$

Remark 3. The solution of the arising nonlinear finite element problems can rely on various efficient methods, see e.g. [16].

3 Discrete maximum principles

3.1 Classical matrix maximum principles

Let us consider a linear algebraic system of equations of order $(n+m) \times (n+m)$:

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}}\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \bar{\mathbf{b}},$$

where the matrix $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ has the following structure:

$$\bar{\mathbf{A}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix} . \tag{24}$$

In the above, $\mathbf{I}$ is an $m \times m$ identity matrix, $\mathbf{0}$ is a $m \times n$ zero matrix. In a (surface) finite element setting, such a partitioning arises corresponding to interior and boundary points.

We first recall some classical definitions and results, see, e.g. [8, 27]. We follow the terminology of [15]. Throughout, inequalities for matrices or vectors are understood elementwise, and $\mathbf{e}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{e}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{e}}$ denote the vectors consisting of n, m or $n+m$ numbers, respectively.

Definition 1. The matrix $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ in (24) satisfies

(a) the *discrete weak maximum principle (DwMP)* if for an arbitrary vector $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = (c_1, ..., c_{n+m})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ satisfying $(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\bar{\mathbf{c}})_i \leq 0,\ i = 1, 2, ..., n$, one has

$$\max_{i=1,2,...,n+m} c_i \ \leq \ \max\{0, \max_{i=n+1,...,n+m} c_i\};$$

(b) the *discrete strict weak maximum principle (DWMP)* if for any vector $\bar{\mathbf{c}} = (c_1, ..., c_{n+m})^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n+m}$ satisfying $(\bar{\mathbf{A}}\bar{\mathbf{c}})_i \leq 0,\ i = 1, 2, ..., n$, one has

$$\max_{i=1,2,...,n+m} c_i \ = \ \max_{i=n+1,...,n+m} c_i.$$

(DMPs without the term 'weak' also assert that only constant vectors may attain a maximum for 'interior' indices, but we do not address this property here.)

Based on [9, 15] we have the following result, formulated in this way in [19]:

Theorem 4. *If the matrix* $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ *in (24) satisfies the following conditions:*

(i) $a_{ij} \le 0 \qquad (\forall i = 1, \dots, n,\ j = 1, \dots, n+m;\quad i \ne j)$,

(ii) $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n+m} a_{ij} \ge 0 \qquad (\forall i = 1, \dots, n)$,

(iii) $\mathbf{A}$ *is positive definite,*

then $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ *possesses the DwMP.*

If the inequality in condition (ii) is replaced by equality, then $\bar{\mathbf{A}}$ *possesses the DWMP.*

3.2 The discrete maximum principle for the elliptic problem

3.2.1 The main results

First we verify the underlying matrix maximum principle for the stiffness matrix of our elliptic problem.

Theorem 5. *Let (A1)–(A4) hold and let us consider a family of simplicial triangulations* $\mathcal{T}_h$ $(h > 0)$ *satisfying the following property: for any* $i = 1, 2, ..., n,\ j = 1, 2, ..., \bar{n}$ $(i \ne j)$

$$\nabla_{S_h}\chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\chi_j \le -\frac{\sigma_0}{h^2} < 0 \tag{25}$$

on $\operatorname{supp}\chi_i \cap \operatorname{supp}\chi_j \subset S_h$ *with* $\sigma_0 > 0$ *independent of* i, j *and* h. *Let the simplicial triangulations* $\mathcal{T}_h$ *be regular, i.e. there exist constants* $m_1, m_2 > 0$ *such that for any* $h > 0$ *and any simplex* $T_h \in \mathcal{T}_h$

$$m_1 h^d \le \operatorname{meas}(T_h) \le m_2 h^d \tag{26}$$

(where $\operatorname{meas}(T_h)$ *denotes the* d*-dimensional measure of* T_h*).*

Then for sufficiently small h, *the matrix* $\bar{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})$ *defined in (23) has the following properties:*

(i) $a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \le 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{n}$ *such that* $i \ne j$.

(ii) $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \ge 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$

(iii) $\mathbf{A}(\bar{c})$ *is positive definite.*

Proof. Let us recall that for any $i, = 1, 2, \dots, n,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{n}$,

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \int_{S_h} \Big(b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h) \nabla_{S_h}\chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\chi_j \ + r^{-l}(x, u_h)\chi_i\chi_j \Big).$$

Now we prove properties (i)–(iii).

(i) Let $i = 1, 2, \dots, n,\ j = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{n}$ with $i \ne j$ and let S_h^{ij} denote the interior of $\operatorname{supp}\chi_i \cap \operatorname{supp}\chi_j \subset S_h$. If $S_h^{ij} = \emptyset$ then

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = 0.$$

If $S_h^{ij} \neq \emptyset$ then we use property (A3), namely that $b(\cdot, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h) \geq \mu_0$, and (25), further, $r(\cdot, u_h) \geq 0$ and the fact $0 \leq \chi_i \leq 1$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots, \bar{n})$, which imply

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \leq -\frac{\sigma_0}{h^2}\,\mu_0\ \mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij}) + \int_{S_h^{ij}} r^{-l}(x, u_h). \tag{27}$$

Here, from (16),

$$\int_{S_h^{ij}} r^{-l}(x, u_h) \leq \int_{S_h^{ij}} \Big(\alpha + \beta |u_h|^{p_1 - 2}\Big).$$

We now further estimate the integral from above. From assumption (A4) we have $2 \leq p_1 < \hat{p}$, where $\hat{p} = \frac{2d}{d-p}$ (if $d > p$) and $\hat{p} := +\infty$ (if $d \leq p$). Let us also consider the Sobolev embedding estimate (2), where $p^* := \frac{pd}{d-p}$ (if $d > p$) and $p^* := \infty$ (if $d \leq p$) were defined. Since $2 \leq p$ from (A1), we clearly have

$$\hat{p} \leq p^*. \tag{28}$$

Hence p_1 also satisfies $p_1 < p^*$, which implies that the Sobolev embedding estimate (2) holds with this p_1. Now, assume first that $p_1 > 2$ and let us fix a real number r satisfying

$$\frac{d}{2} < r \leq \frac{p^*}{p_1 - 2}\ . \tag{29}$$

Such a number r always exists, since for $d \leq p$ there is no upper bound ($p^* := \infty$), and for $d > p$ the assumption $p_1 < \hat{p}$ implies

$$p_1 - 2 < \hat{p} - 2 = \frac{2p}{d-p} = \frac{2p^*}{d}$$

which yields

$$\frac{d}{2} < \frac{p^*}{p_1 - 2}.$$

Further, the assumption $d \geq 2$ on the dimension of the manifold implies $r > 1$. (In theory the trivial case $d = 1$ is also allowed, then we must assume that $r > 1$ is chosen, which is allowed since $\frac{p^*}{p_1 - 2} > 1$.)

Now let $s > 1$ be chosen such that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s} = 1$. Then Hölder's inequality implies

$$\int_{S_h^{ij}} |u_h|^{p_1-2} \leq \|1\|_{L^s(S_h^{ij})} \Big\| |u_h|^{p_1-2} \Big\|_{L^r(S_h^{ij})} = \mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/s}\, \|u_h\|^{p_1-2}_{L^{(p_1-2)r}(S_h^{ij})}\,. \tag{30}$$

Here $(p_1 - 2)r \leq p^*$ and (2) imply

$$\|u_h\|^{p_1-2}_{L^{(p_1-2)r}(S_h^{ij})} \leq \|u_h\|^{p_1-2}_{L^{(p_1-2)r}(S)} \leq k_1^{p_1-2} \|u_h\|^{p_1-2}_{1,p,S}\,.$$

Here, by Lemma 3, $\|u_h\|_{1,p,S}$ is bounded independently of h. Hence, (30) is bounded as

$$\int_{S_h^{ij}} |u_h|^{p_1-2} \leq K_1\, \mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/s} \tag{31}$$

with some constant $K_1 > 0$ independent of h. Finally, if $p_1 = 2$ then the corresponding equality (31) holds trivially with $s = 1$.

The integral of the positive constant α is simply

$$\int_{S_h^{ij}} \alpha = \alpha \,\mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij}).$$

Substituting the two estimates into (27), we obtain

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \le \Big(-\frac{\sigma_0 \mu_0}{h^2} + \alpha \Big) \,\mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij}) + \beta K_1 \,\mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/s}.$$

For sufficiently small h, we can write

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) \le A^{ij}(h) := -\frac{C_0}{h^2} \,\mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij}) + C_1 \,\mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/s},$$

more precisely, there exist positive constants h_0, C_0 and C_1 independently of h and i, j such that the above inequality holds for $h < h_0$. Then, using that $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{s} = 1$ and the regularity (26) of the mesh, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A^{ij}(h) = \; & \mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/s} \Big(-\frac{C_0}{h^2} \,\mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/r} + C_1 \Big) \\ \le \; & \mathrm{meas}(S_h^{ij})^{1/s} \Big(- C_2 h^{-2+(d/r)} + C_1 \Big). \end{aligned}$$

Since (29) implies $\frac{d}{r} < 2$, the term in brackets tends to $-\infty$ as $h \to 0$ and hence $A^{ij}(h) < 0$ for $h < h_0$.

Altogether, we obtain that there exists $h_0 > 0$ such that for $h \le h_0$ and all i, j

$$a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) < 0.$$

(ii) For any $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) = \; & \int_{S_h} \Big(b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h) \; \nabla_{S_h} \chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h} \big(\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} \chi_j \big) + r^{-l}(x, u_h) \; \chi_i \big(\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} \chi_j \big) \Big) \\ = \; & \int_{S_h} r^{-l}(x, u_h) \, \chi_i \ge 0, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

using the fact that $\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} \chi_j \equiv 1$ and that r, χ_i are nonnegative.

(iii) For any vector $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{d} \ne 0$ and corresponding finite element function $v_h = \sum_{j=1}^{n} d_j \chi_j \ne 0$, using that $b \ge \mu_0$ and $r \ge 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\mathbf{d} \cdot \mathbf{d} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} a_{ij}(\bar{\mathbf{c}}) d_j d_i = \; & \int_{S_h} \Big(b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h) \; |\nabla_{S_h} v_h|^2 + r^{-l}(x, u_h) u_h^2 \Big) \\ \ge \; & \mu_0 \int_{S_h} |\nabla_{S_h} v_h|^2 > 0 \end{aligned}$$

hence $\mathbf{A}(\bar{c})$ is positive definite. □

Now, it is easy to derive the analogue of Theorem 2 for system (22), i.e. the discrete maximum principle.

Theorem 6 (Discrete maximum principle)**.** *Let problem (3) satisfy*

$$f(x) - q(x,0) \leq 0 \quad (x \in S) \tag{33}$$

and consider the discretization given in subsection 2.3. Under the conditions of Theorem 5, we have

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u_h^l \leq \max\{0, \max_{\partial S} g_h^l\}. \tag{34}$$

In particular, if $g \geq 0$ then

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u_h^l = \max_{\partial S} g_h^l, \tag{35}$$

and if $g \leq 0$ then we have the discrete nonpositivity property

$$\max_{\overline{S}} u_h^l \leq 0. \tag{36}$$

Proof. It follows from Theorem 5 and the properties of piecewise linear functions. Namely, Theorem 5 states that the matrix $\bar{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})$ satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4, further, (33) implies that $(\bar{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\bar{\mathbf{c}})_i = d_i = \int_{S_h} \hat{f}^{-l}\chi_i \leq 0$. Hence, for our system $\bar{\mathbf{A}}(\bar{\mathbf{c}})\bar{\mathbf{c}} = \mathbf{d}$, Theorem 4 provides the algebraic matrix maximum principle DwMP, which is equivalent to

$$\max_{B_i \in \overline{S}_h} u_h(B_i) \leq \max\{0, \max_{B_i \in \partial S_h} g_h(B_i)\} \tag{37}$$

for the node points. Since u_h is a piecewise linear function, hence (37) is also true in the elements between the node points, i.e. on the whole domain $\overline{S}_h$:

$$\max_{\overline{S}_h} u_h \leq \max\{0, \max_{\partial S_h} g_h\} \tag{38}$$

The lift preserves extreme values, hence (38) implies (34). Finally, (35) and (36) are trivial consequences of (34). □

3.2.2 Related results

One can verify in the same way the discrete minimum principle for system (22), in analogy with Theorem 6:

Theorem 7. *Let problem* (3) *satisfy*

$$f(x) - q(x,0) \geq 0 \quad (x \in S)$$

and consider the discretisation given in subsection 2.3. Under the conditions of Theorem 5, we have

$$\min_{\overline{S}} u_h^l \geq \min\{0, \min_{\partial S} g_h^l\}.$$

In particular, if $g \leq 0$ then

$$\min_{\overline{S}} u_h^l = \min_{\partial S} g_h^l,$$

and if $g \geq 0$ then we have the discrete nonnegativity property

$$\min_{\overline{S}} u_h^l \geq 0.$$

In the special case $q \equiv 0$, the counterpart of Theorem 3 is valid, i.e. equality holds without assuming any sign condition on g. We formulate this for both the maximum and minimum principles. Moreover, the strict negativity in (25) can be replaced by a weaker nonnegativity condition, and no regularity condition on the mesh like (26) needs to be assumed.

Theorem 8. *Let us consider the following special case of problem (3):*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}_S\Big(b(x,u,\nabla_S u)\,\nabla_S u\Big) = f(x) & \text{on } S, \\ u = g(x) & \text{on } \partial S. \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

under assumptions (A1)–(A3). Let the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$ satisfy the following property: for any $i = 1, 2, ..., n,\ j = 1, 2, ..., \bar{n}\ (i \neq j)$

$$\nabla_{S_h}\chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\chi_j \leq 0. \tag{40}$$

Then the following results hold:

(1) If $f \leq 0$ then $\max\limits_{\overline{S}} u_h^l = \max\limits_{\partial S} g_h^l$.

(2) If $f \geq 0$ then $\min\limits_{\overline{S}} u_h^l = \min\limits_{\partial S} g_h^l$.

(3) If $f = 0$ then the ranges of u_h^l and g_h^l coincide, i.e. we have $[\min\limits_{\overline{S}} u_h^l, \max\limits_{\overline{S}} u_h^l] = [\min\limits_{\partial S} g_h^l, \max\limits_{\partial S} g_h^l]$ *for the corresponding intervals.*

Proof. To verify (1), we rely on Theorem 4 again, whose conditions follow similarly as in Theorem 5. The difference in the proof arises in proving property (i), i.e.

$$a_{ij}(\overline{\mathbf{c}}) \leq 0, \tag{41}$$

which now follows trivially: since the assumption $q \equiv 0$ implies $r \equiv 0$, we simply have

$$a_{ij}(\overline{\mathbf{c}}) = \int_{S_h} b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\nabla_{S_h}\chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\chi_j$$

and thus (40) and the condition $b \geq \mu_0 > 0$ readily yield (41). Further, in property (ii), (32) is simply replaced by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} a_{ij}(\overline{\mathbf{c}}) = \int_{S_h} b^{-l}(x, u_h, \nabla_{S_h} u_h)\ \nabla_{S_h}\chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\bar{n}} \chi_j\Big) = 0,$$

hence we can apply the final statement of Theorem 4 to obtain that DWMP holds. This imnplies, similarly to the argument of Theorem (7) on piecewise linear functions, that $\max\limits_{\overline{S}} u_h^l = \max\limits_{\partial S} g_h^l$.

Statement (2) follows from (1) by replacing u by $-u$, and (3) is a direct consequence of (1) and (2). □

3.2.3 On geometric mesh properties

Conditions (25) and (40) are easy to check, since the values $\nabla_{S_h}\chi_i \cdot \nabla_{S_h}\chi_j$ are constant on each element. These conditions have a straightforward geometric interpretation: the angles must be uniformly acute for (25) and nonobtuse for (40).

The currently available constructions of acute triangulations on surfaces of various types and close issues have been recently surveyed in the paper [28, Section 3], see also the literature therein. We may notice as well that the acuteness property is stable with respect to small perturbations of the vertices involved, therefore e.g. constructions of acute triangulations on planes (see [28, 4]) can be easily adapted for producing acute triangulations for certain (not very curved) surfaces in 3D.

We underline that many real-life problems appearing in biology, biophysics and biochemistry are posed on sphere-like surfaces. In typical cases the surface at hand there is a membrane, a surface of a cell, or of a nucleous, a surface of a crystal, or some other spherical object, see for instance [13, 14] and the references therein. Acute triangulations and refinement on a spherical surface will be discussed in Section 4.

For general curved surfaces, the issue of refinements preserving acuteness (and the construction of families of acute triangulations) is a more involved task than the case of nonobtuse triangulations (similarly to the case of Euclidean domains). For the latter, for example, a constructive proof of existence of a family of nonobtuse triangulations of surfaces of cylindric-type 3D domains is given in [23]. It as based on the construction of conforming nonobtuse tetrahedral meshes and the fact that faces of nonobtuse tetrahedra are nonobtuse triangles.

3.3 Examples

We may mention some important real-life examples from the paper [2] where the corresponding CMP has been proved. The arising equations include the following models:

(i) gas dynamics:

$$-\operatorname{div}_S\Big(\varrho(|\nabla_S u|^2)\,\nabla_S u\Big) = 0$$

where the function ϱ, which describes the relation of the velocity and the density, is determined by Bernoulli's law;

(ii) surface p-Laplacian:

$$-\operatorname{div}_S\Big(|\nabla_S u|^{p-2}\,\nabla_S u\Big) = 0$$

which minimizes the p-Dirichlet norm on S;

(iii) radiative cooling:

$$-\operatorname{div}_S\Big(\kappa(x,u)|\nabla_S u|^{p-2}\,\nabla_S u\Big) + \sigma u^4 = 0$$

where κ is the coefficient of heat conduction and σ is the radiation, assumed to be constant. (Here $u \geq 0$ is of physical interest [20], hence the nonlinearity is defined as $q(x,z) := z^4$ for $z \geq 0$ only and as $q(x,z) \equiv 0$ for $z \leq 0$.)

According to our results, if the finite element discretization of the corresponding boundary value problem satisfies the angle conditions described in subsection 3.2.3, then the numerical solution satisfies the DMP. The typical situation is that the boundary function g describes a nonnegative physical quantity: $g \geq 0$. Then Theorem 7 ensures the discrete nonnegativity property, i.e. that the numerical solution satisfies (36):

$$\min_{\overline{S}} u_h^l \geq 0$$

in accordance with the physical reality.

4 Numerical experiments

In this section we present the results of numerical tests performed for radiative cooling and p-Laplacian models from Section 3.3 posed on two different surfaces with boundary: a hemisphere and a semi-torus, respectively. For the case of hemisphere, the surface is approximated by subsequent refinements of the initial grid, taken to be the half of an icosahedron. In the refinement step each triangle is first divided into four similar triangles and then newly generated vertices are projected to the surface of the hemisphere (cf. [13]). The meshes generated in this way are illustrated in Figure 2. The finite element meshes for the semi-torus are generated via the initial subdivision of it into round strips, such that the vertices on one side of each strip lie on equal distances and on the other side similarly but in "chess-order", and finally linking the vertices as in Figure 3. The quality of meshes for both cases in terms of minimal and maximal angles is illustrated in Figure 1.



Figure 1: The minimum and maximum angles of the meshes generated for the test problems posed on the hemisphere (left) and the semi-torus (right).

4.1 Radiative cooling on a hemisphere

First, we carry out some numerical experiments for the radiative cooling model from (iii) of subsection 3.3 with $\kappa = 1$ and $p = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta_S u + \sigma u^4 &= 0 \qquad \text{in } S, \\ u &= g \qquad \text{on } \partial S, \end{aligned}$$

with the nonlinearity defined as $q(x, z) := z^4$ for $z \geq 0$ and $q(x, z) \equiv 0$ for $z \leq 0$. We chose $\sigma = 1$, and select the boundary function as

$$g(x, y) = 1 + xy.$$

We assume that S is a hemisphere of the radius 1, therefore $\mathrm{Ran}(g) = [0.5, 1.5]$, in particular, g is a nonnegative function over the boundary.

The approximation presented in Figure 2 clearly illustrate that the discrete maximum principle holds.

The meshes in Figure 2 have 91, 341, 1321 nodes, and 160, 640, 2560 elements, respectively.


numerical solution; Ran(u) = [0.52447,1.4755]
Ran(g) = [0.5,1.5]
numerical solution; Ran(u) = [0.5,1.5]
Ran(g) = [0.5,1.5]
numerical solution; Ran(u) = [0.5,1.5]
Ran(g) = [0.5,1.5]

Figure 2: Finite element meshes and approximations for the radiative cooling problem.

4.2 p-Laplacian on a semi-torus

On the semi-torus we performed the experiment for the p-Laplacian with $p = 4$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} -\operatorname{div}_S \left(|\nabla_S u|^2 \nabla_S u \right) &= 0 \qquad \text{in } S, \\ u &= g \qquad \text{on } \partial S. \end{aligned}$$

Homogeneous p-Laplacian equations with $p = 4$ arise e.g. in rheology, see [6]. We prescribe the following boundary data

$$g(x, y) = 10 + x, \qquad \text{hence} \quad \operatorname{Ran}(g) = [3, 17].$$

The used finite element meshes and the validity of the discrete maximum principle are again clearly illustrated in Figure 3.

The meshes in Figure 3 have 36, 136, 528 nodes, and 64, 256, 1024 elements, respectively.


numerical solution; Ran(u) = [3.134,17]
Ran(g) = [3,17]
numerical solution; Ran(u) = [3.0063,17]
Ran(g) = [3,17]
numerical solution; Ran(u) = [3.0003,17]
Ran(g) = [3,17]

Figure 3: Finite element approximations for the p-Laplacian with $p = 4$.

Acknowledgements

The work of János Karátson is supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund OTKA, No. 112157. The work of Balázs Kovács is funded by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, SFB 1173.

A grant from the Eötvös Loránd University made it possible that B.K. spent a week in Budapest in November 2016, which allowed personal discussions between J.K. and B.K. during the finalization of this paper.

References

[1] Adams, R.A., *Sobolev spaces*, Academic Press, New York-London, 1975.

[2] Antonini, P., Mugnai, D. and Pucci, P., Quasilinear elliptic inequalities on complete Riemannian manifolds, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (6) 87 (2007), 582-600.

[3] Aubin, T., *Some Nonlinear Problems in Riemannian Geometry*, 1998, Springer-Verlag.

[4] Brandts, J., Korotov, S., Křížek, M., and Šolc, J., On nonobtuse simplicial partitions, *SIAM Rev.* 51 (2009), 317–335.

[5] Burman, E., Hansbo, P., Larson, M.G., Larsson, K. and Massing, A., Finite element approximation of the Laplace–Beltrami operator on a surface with boundary, *arXiv: 11509.08597* (2015)

[6] Busuioc, V., Cioranescu, D., On a class of electrorheological fluids. Contributions in honor of the memory of Ennio De Giorgi, *Ricerche Mat.* 49 (2000), suppl., 29–60.

[7] Ciarlet, Ph., *The finite element method for elliptic problems,* North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1978

[8] Ciarlet, P. G., Discrete maximum principle for finite-difference operators, *Aequationes Math.* 4 (1970), 338–352.

[9] Ciarlet, P. G., Raviart, P.-A., Maximum principle and uniform convergence for the finite element method, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* 2 (1973), 17–31.

[10] Demlow, A., Higher–order finite element methods and pointwise error estimates for elliptic problems on surfaces, *SIAM. J. Num. Anal.* 47(2) (2009), 805–807.

[11] Drăgănescu, A., Dupont, T. F., Scott, L. R., Failure of the discrete maximum principle for an elliptic finite element problem, *Math. Comp.* 74 (2005), no. 249, 1–23 (electronic).

[12] Dziuk, G., Finite elements for the Beltrami operator on arbitrary surfaces. *Partial differential equations and calculus of variations*, pages 142–155., 1988.

[13] Dziuk, G. and Elliott, C.M., Finite elements on evolving surfaces. *IMA Journal of Numerical Analysis*, 27(Issue 2):262–292., 2007.

[14] Dziuk, G. and Elliott, C.M., Finite element methods for surface PDEs. *Acta Numerica*, 22:289–396., 2013.

[15] Faragó, I., Matrix and Discrete Maximum Principles, in: *LSSC 2009*, LNCS 5910, 563–570 (2010).

[16] Faragó, I., Karátson, J., *Numerical solution of nonlinear elliptic problems via preconditioning operators. Theory and applications.* Advances in Computation, Volume 11, NOVA Science Publishers, New York, 2002.

[17] Gilbarg, D., Trudinger, N. S., *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order* (2nd edition), Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 224, Springer, 1983.

[18] Karátson, J., Korotov, S., Discrete maximum principles for finite element solutions of nonlinear elliptic problems with mixed boundary conditions, *Numer. Math.* 99 (2005), 669–698.

[19] Karátson, J., Korotov, S., Some discrete maximum principles arising for nonlinear elliptic finite element problems, *Comput. Math. Appl.* 70 (2015), no. 11, 2732-2741.

[20] Keller, H. B., Elliptic boundary value problems suggested by nonlinear diffusion processes, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 35 (1969), 363–381.

[21] Korotov, S., Křížek, M., Acute type refinements of tetrahedral partitions of polyhedral domains, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 39 (2001), 724–733.

[22] Korotov, S., Křížek, M., Neittaanmäki, P., Weakened acute type condition for tetrahedral triangulations and the discrete maximum principle, *Math. Comp.* 70 (2001), 107–119.

[23] Korotov, S., On conforming nonobtuse tetrahedralizations of some cylindrical-type domains with curved boundaries, in: *Proceedings of the International Conference on Applications of Mathematics (AM2012)*, Institute of Mathematics, Prague, Czech Republic (dedicated to the 60th birthday of M. Křížek), ed. by J. Brandts et al., 2012, 131–138.

[24] Protter, M. H., Weinberger, H. F., *Maximum principles in differential equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

[25] Pucci, P., Serrin, J. B., *The Maximum Principle*, Springer, 2007.

[26] Xu, J., Zikatanov, L., A monotone finite element scheme for convection-diffusion equations, *Math. Comp.* 68 (1999), 1429–1446.

[27] Varga, R., *Matrix iterative analysis*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1962.

[28] Zamfirescu C. T., Survey of two-dimensional acute triangulations, *Discrete Mathematics* 313 (2013), 35–49.